



Community Development Planning Division
P. O. Box 1083
Corvallis, OR 97339
(541) 766-6908

AGENDA

Corvallis Planning Commission
7:00 pm, Wednesday, December 2, 2015
Downtown Fire Station, 400 NW Harrison, 2nd Floor

- I. Visitors Propositions - Opportunity for public input on matters of interest to the Planning Commission other than a land use application under current or future consideration by the Planning Commission.
- II. Deliberations – Kings Boulevard Extension (PLD15-00003) Modification and a Detailed Development Plan
- III. Minutes –
October 21, 2015
November 4, 2015
- IV. Old Business
- V. New Business
- VI. Adjournment

For the hearing impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours notice.
For the visually impaired, an agenda in larger print is available.

Proposed Tentative Public Meeting Schedule for 2015

CC = City Council (for agendas or questions about meetings, call **541.766.6901**)

For questions about listed cases or about the following Boards or Commissions, call **541-766-6908**

PC Planning Commission (usually meets first and third Wednesdays at 7 p.m.)

LDHB Land Development Hearings Board (meets as needed)

DAB Downtown Advisory Board (meets second Wednesday at 5:30 pm in the Madison Avenue Meeting Room)

HRC Historic Resources Commission (meets second Tuesday at 6:30 p.m.) - ***Meetings are now held at the Fire Station Meeting Room. On occasion, an additional meeting may be held on the 4th Tuesday of the month, usually in the Madison Avenue Meeting Room.***

THE OFFICIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR EACH MEETING WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE AGENDA. CC AGENDAS ARE DISTRIBUTED THE THURSDAY BEFORE A CITY COUNCIL MEETING; AGENDAS FOR OTHER MEETINGS (PC, LDHB, CCI, HRC) ARE USUALLY DISTRIBUTED ONE WEEK BEFORE EACH MEETING.

Meeting	Date	Description	Location
PC, 7 pm	Dec. 2	Deliberations – Kings Boulevard Extension (PLD15-00003)	*Fire Station
CC, 6:30 pm	Dec. 7	Regular Meeting	*Fire Station
HRC, 6:30 pm	Dec. 8	Regular Meeting	*Fire Station
PC, 7 pm	Dec. 16	TBD	*Fire Station
CC, 6:30 pm	Dec. 21	Regular Meeting	*Fire Station
	Dec. 25	CHRISTMAS HOLIDAY	
	JAN. 1	NEW YEARS DAY HOLIDAY	

*Fire Station, 400 NW Harrison Boulevard, second floor meeting room

*** Library Main Meeting Room, 645 NW Monroe Avenue, main level

****Majestic Theater, 115 SW 2nd Street

**Madison Meeting Room, 500 SW Madison Avenue

****LaSells Stewart Ctr. 875 SW 26th Street, Corvallis

The City Website is located at www.CorvallisOregon.gov

tbd=to be decided



Community Development
Planning Division
501 SW Madison Avenue
Corvallis, OR 97333

**DRAFT
CITY OF CORVALLIS
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
October 21, 2015**

Present

Jasmin Woodside, Chair
Ronald Sessions, Vice Chair
Roger Lizut
Paul Woods
Tom Jensen
Carl Price
Penny York, Council Liaison

Staff

Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager
Claire Pate, Recorder

Visitors

Excused Absence

G. Tucker Selko
Rob Welsh
Jim Ridlington

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

	Agenda Item	Recommendations
I.	Visitors' Propositions	None
II.	Continue Review of the Unresolved Planning Issues List	
III.	Review of Article I (Chapters 1.0 – 1.6) of the Land Development Code (if time allows)	Postponed
IV.	Old Business	
V.	New Business	Opinion given for City Council consideration
VII.	Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:50pm

Attachments to the October 21, 2015 minutes:

A. List of Unresolved Planning Issues.

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

The Corvallis Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Jasmin Woodside at 7:00 p.m. in the Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room, 400 NW Harrison Boulevard. Introductions were made.

I. VISITOR'S PROPOSITIONS. None.

II. REVIEW OF THE UNRESOLVED PLANNING ISSUES LIST.

Chair Woodside said that this would be a continuation of the work the commissioners had begun during their last meeting, wherein items on the Unresolved Planning Issues list (**Attachment A**) were reviewed to determine if they should remain on the list or be taken off. If left on the list, commissioners assigned them a priority rating based on importance of the issue to the current Commission, and another rating for simplicity/complexity or controversy in resolving the issue. They had left off with Item #15.

Item #15:

Manager Young said that in reality it was not a burden to post two signs for property that has more than one street frontage. **Agreement:** Strike from list.

Item #16:

Manager Young said this issue had not been dealt with, since the OSU zone was created after the Sign Code. He could not say that there had been problems with tall signs in the OSU zone, but it would be relatively easy to fix. Commissioner Sessions suggested there might be a need for tall signs for some buildings such as Reser Stadium, and Commissioner Jensen felt it appropriate for OSU to meet sign code requirements similar to adjacent businesses and buildings. Commissioner Woods suggested that this might be able to be folded into the OSU District Plan update. Manager Young said that he would send an email to OSU staff asking that it be given consideration as part of the District Plan. **Agreement:** Keep on list; high priority and high simplicity/lack of complexity.

Item #17:

Manager Young said that this came about prior to the enrolment boom at OSU, and had more to do with the fact that much of the single-family, detached housing coming on line was multi-storied. Councilor York said she had had some of her constituents talk about the issue of finding single-story housing. Commissioners Woods and Price agreed with the note that market factors may have more influence than regulation would have. Commissioner Sessions said that ADA requires accessibility and convertibility, in that one in ten apartment units has to be accessible and another that could be converted. He added that even if it became a requirement to have single-story dwellings in residential developments, it would be difficult to limit sales to someone who needs it for accessibility. Commissioner Woods said that one of the City's goals was to have a compact, efficient urban style of development and this might be in conflict with this. **Agreement:** Strike from list.

Item #18:

Commissioner Woods said that this might be combined with Item #53 in that there were similarities. Commissioner Sessions said that they seemed to be two different issues in that if you have a different use type classification, you have to develop code to prescribe how to deal with that use type. This is a different issue from looking at scaling factors. He did not believe that they needed to develop a different use type classification, in that this use would typically be lumped in with the category of assisted care or rest homes. Manager Young said that assisted living facilities currently falls into

group residential/group care. It is somewhat complicated in that it is based on the number of occupants. State law requires that these types of facilities cannot be treated differently from a single-family residence if they do not exceed a certain threshold of occupants. One of the questions that might be answered through resolution of this issue is whether an assisted living facility is any different from group residential/group care, and therefore in need of a separate classification. Item #20 speaks to Group Residential use types, and talks about establishing a minimum bed/acre standard, which might be getting at a similar issue to Item #53 which speaks to densities. This issue has come up a few times. Commissioner Price asked if this was aimed at the assisted living-type of facilities that are not necessarily in any of those groups, such as those with stand-alone type condos as well as assisted living facilities. Young said he was not sure. Stoneybrook, for example, provides continuity of care and is already in existence. Group residential/group care is conditionally allowed in RS-5 and permitted outright in RS-6 and RS-12. **Agreement:** Strike from list.

Item #19:

Manager Young explained that the City had received direction from DLCD to make some changes in how residential Planned Developments (PDs) are treated. In response, and as part of the 2006 periodic review, the City removed PD overlays in residential areas where the PD had never been initiated; i.e. there had not been a Conceptual or Detailed Development Plan approved. Because of the “Needed Housing” statute, the DLCD’s direction was that those Overlays should be removed. Also, a process was created so that, for those areas that had a Conceptual Plan approval but no Detailed Development Plan approval, an applicant could apply to have the PD Overlay administratively removed. In other areas, such as Timberhill, where there is long term development that has been built out over the past many years, it is all subject to a Planned Development and all future phases are subject to that review. He could not say for sure what more needed to be done. Councilor York said that the “Needed Housing” issue is an important one and City Council has had executive sessions with the City Attorney around this issue. She would want to make sure the attorneys review what more might need to be done. **Agreement:** Tentatively strike it from list, subject to Councilor York reviewing it with the City Manager and City Attorney.

Item #20:

Manager Young explained that there is no density given for a Group home or Assisted Living facility, so there is no minimum or maximum. One could build such a facility with six bedrooms, or with 200 bedrooms assuming a developer could meet all the other code requirements. This is getting at a potential need for establishing a density for these types of facilities. Commissioner Price said he would like to have this item struck from the list. He opined that establishing a minimum density for the type of facility that might house Alzheimer’s patients might preclude the fenced in open space that can be desirable for patients to be able to wander outside in safety. If the item stays on the list, he would advise that they tread carefully to ensure these types of facilities have enough space to meet their needs. Commissioner Sessions suggested that this might be combined with Item #53 as it looks at density equivalents. **Agreement:** Strike from list, but keep Item #53.

Item #21:

Manager Young said that this type of “temporary” shelter can be seen in many places such as over RV’s in driveway, etc. In response to a commissioner question, he said that he was not aware of a limit on the amount of time they could be in use. Several commissioners voiced the opinion that though they could be unsightly, unless there was a safety concern there was not a strong need to regulate them, and it could be an enforcement challenge. Manager Young said that there could be some concerns about wind and whether structures were adequately anchored, etc. Staff do not get complaints about them very often. **Agreement:** Strike from list.

Item #22:

Manager Young said that this issue addresses the question of what might be problems caused by condominium plats. Condominium conversions happen outside of any kind of City review. There is a State process through which an apartment building can be carved up into condominium units which can then be offered up for sale. There have been concerns about taking rental properties off the market and putting them into an ownership category. There might be some public utility issues raised by such conversions, but otherwise he could not say that there were issues with them. Commissioner Sessions said that there were differences in construction, such as firewalls and sound attenuation, between apartments and townhouses. He suggested that the issue might be whether during a conversion process, some upgrades might have to be done. Manager Young said that in terms of utilities, condominium owners' associations likely would have the responsibility to deal with the conversion process for the utilities. **Agreement:** Strike from list.

Item #23:

In response to a question from Commissioner Woods, Manager Young said the low score given to this item was based on priorities at the time this was added to the list. In response to a question from Commissioner Jensen, he said that the proposal from the Infill Task Force provided a definition of infill development that was a little problematic from the implementation standpoint. The goal was to hitch certain development standards to infill development, and so it needed to have clear definition. Some of this work has been done in a different way with the establishment of the University Neighborhoods Overlay area, but the issue may not be completely addressed. Commissioner Sessions said he believes it is still an issue, and it might be appropriate to take some staff time to assemble some of the comments from the Task Force and see what issues still need to be resolved. Since the City is trying to achieve densification and do infill development, clear direction is needed for these efforts. Commissioner Woods suggested that they invite a member or members of the Infill Task Force to address the Commission about the issue. Manager Young said he would contact them about it. Commissioner Jensen expressed his concerns about the spate of infill development that occurred wherein three-bedroom houses were being bulldozed, property was subdivided, and then two five-bedroom houses were constructed on each side. The twenty bedrooms constructed do not provide six-plus times the tax revenue that the previous house did, and there is six times the impact on the City's infrastructure. Manager Young said that changing the definition of infill might not have an impact on that situation; however, the recent amendment to the density provisions disallowing the rounding up concept had addressed this issue, to some extent. **Agreement:** Keep on list; high priority and low simplicity/lack of complexity.

Item #24:

Manager Young said that this remains an on-going recommendation from the Neighborhood Planning Work Group, and it should be addressed with review of the Comprehensive Plan and ultimately the Zone District Map. That review will be looking at the Comprehensive Plan designations of property within the Urban Growth Boundary, and there should also be room to look at the issue of where it makes sense to have density and to perhaps revisit some of the zoning that was put into place elsewhere in the City. There are two sides on this issue: one perspective is that high density is appropriate around the university in order to reduce the number of vehicle trips to campus since it is easier to bike and walk for those living close in. However, there have been issues with the impacts of higher density development. In response to a question from Commissioner Woods, Manager Young said that the University Neighborhood Overlay had put in a maximum Floor Area Ratio for new development, setting a factor based on lot size. This gets at scale of development, but does not necessarily limit dwelling unit density. Commissioner York said that this had come to City Council as a recommendation, because of some concerns from neighborhoods that they had not been involved in

the work of developing the zoning map. City Council determined that it needed to be addressed as part of review of the Comprehensive Plan after the Vision and Action Plan work. There was additional discussion about the fact that the Planning Commission was giving this a low priority only because it was not really in its purview to do anything until the work on the Comprehensive Plan update came up for consideration. Manager Young said he would add a note that this item would be expected as part of the upcoming Comprehensive Plan review. **Agreement:** Keep it on list; low priority and low simplicity/lack of complexity.

In response to a question from Councilor York, Manager Young said that the Unresolved Planning Issues has not been received by the City Council in the past, though it certainly could.

Item #25:

Manager Young said he was not certain of the intent for this item, but on its face it indicates a desire to have different development standards, such as setbacks, building height, etc., for properties within a Historic District. This might have come out of the Neighborhood Planning Work Group. They had explored the concept of establishing an average front yard setback standard, because in some of the older neighborhoods with historic character the way the buildings address the street is significant. New development with minimal setbacks for buildings contrast with older homes that are setback and have larger front yards and this can have a jarring effect. That effort was ultimately not successful, due to the complexity of the issue. It remains a complex undertaking, because there would be zone standards and a separate set of standards for Historic Districts, which would have to be reconciled.

Commissioner Sessions commented that this brought to mind the issue with the old Gazette-Times building located near a Historic District, and for which they had removed the Planned Development Overlay, leaving it open to the question of how it would be regulated for development. In response to commissioner questions, Manager Young said that the Historic Resources Commission (HRC) did not typically have their own Unresolved Planning Issues list, but certainly had worked on revisions to Chapter 2.9. There are three Historic Districts in Corvallis, one of which is on the OSU campus. The other two are the Avery-Helm and the College Hill West. Other neighborhoods that might have historic character but were not within a District would not be affected by this effort. The HRC is hoping to start work on a Historic Preservation Plan for the community; this item might be something they could consider as part of that effort.

Manager Young went on to say the HRC reviews quite a few applications for construction and/or alteration of buildings in Historic Districts, along with their reviews of alterations to listed Historic structures. Typically, they review exterior changes to buildings. It is a body of land use regulation focused on historic compatibility, and their reviews are among the most highly discretionary decisions that are made by the City. Commissioner Price expressed some concern about Historic Districts becoming a monoculture of a certain type of housing. Manager Young explained that one principle used in historic review is called differentiation, with the goal not necessarily to replicate what already exists, but to complement. He cited the Kelley Engineering building as an example, in that it is clearly differentiated from the historic buildings on campus but is complementary to those buildings. He felt that Commissioner Price raised an interesting issue in that they would have to develop clear and objective standards for Historic Districts which would make it hard to have the discretionary review the HRC has now. **Agreement:** Strike the item from the list, and refer it to HRC for their consideration.

III. REVIEW OF ARTICLE I (CHAPTERS 1.0 – 1.6) OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.

Chair Woodside said that this training would be postponed until after the commissioners complete their work on the Unresolved Planning Issues list.

IV. OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Councilor York asked for an update on any changes coming out of the OSU Plan-Related Task Force's work. Manager Young said that the finalized recommendations would be going into the Council packets for its next meeting, and for a work session scheduled for November 12, 2015. Conversation will occur around whether Council wants to initiate a Comprehensive Plan amendment process. Ultimately, those policies will inform Land Development Code provisions and the updated OSU Master (District) Plan.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Councilor York gave a status report on the selection of consultants for leading the City's Vision and Action Plan review process. The selection team consisted of Councilor York, City Manager Shepard, Kevin Young, Kent Weiss, and Sarah Johnson, and they were unanimous in their selection of one of the candidate teams. She passed around a copy of their proposal. She said that the consultant team they selected had a great approach to community engagement, and expressed a great desire to work with Corvallis. One of the firm's principals had been a consultant for the Corvallis 2010 Vision. Two of the five team members are from the Institute of Population Studies at PSU, and have the needed expertise to work on metrics. They will develop metrics that will work with Corvallis' goals and values, and performance measures that will be easy enough to use and track over time.
- B. Manager Young asked that the commissioners consider rendering an opinion to City Council with regard to an upcoming question the Council will be reviewing. He explained that the question related to Comprehensive Plan Amendment applications, one of which is getting close to being complete and in need of moving through the review process. Specifically, the issue relates to how to interpret Land Development Code language in Chapter 2.1.30.02, regarding the timing of Comprehensive Plan Amendments. Per the City Attorney, the request for interpretation will be going to City Council, but Councilors might want the Planning Commission to weigh in on it.

He explained that the language states that Comprehensive Plan Amendments (CPAs) are to be reviewed semi-annually in March and September by the Planning Commission. In the past, staff has interpreted this in such a way that application timelines were set so that if they were complete they would be considered in March and September. The reality is that often the applications are not complete, so it has happened that if an application was close to completion in March, but not declared complete until April, staff would take the application to Planning Commission in April or May instead of waiting to schedule it in September. The strict interpretation would be to only have the Planning Commission review the applications in those two months, which can lead to an overload of hearings if other land use applications also have to be considered in March and September because of the 120-day rule.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the language "initiated by property owners" and asked if this precluded CPAs initiated by non-property owners. Manager Young said the presumption was that the CPAs were map amendments that would apply to a particular property; however, Commissioner Jensen was right in that this is not always the case. Commissioner Price said that

he likes the way staff has been doing it, in that it does not overburden the Planning Commission at any particular time. It would be burdensome to hear them only twice a year.

Councilor York said that she has heard concerns expressed from some that the City does planning in a piecemeal fashion, with a CPA here and a CPA there as opposed to dealing with the document in a bigger way. She noted that it could be a workload issue, but it also might get discussed in the light of how planning is getting done. Commissioner Price suggested that the Planning Commission could review the applications as they are now, but they could then be grouped together to go to City Council in March and September. Manager Young said that City Council's schedule is full as well, and this might be burdensome for them. He added that there might be some room to define the term "review" as just a check in with Planning Commission and not necessarily a full process. In response to a question from Commissioner Woods about how often CPA applications are received, Manager Young said that Campus Crest was the last one to be considered; however, they had received three other applications in December that are in the process of being completed.

Commissioner Woods said that it would be appropriate to clean up the language in the Comprehensive Plan so that it matched whatever process City Council decided on. Additionally, the concern brought up by Commissioner Jensen about the language "initiated by property owners" should be addressed. She suggested, and commissioners, concurred, that this ought to be added to the Unresolved Planning Issues list.

The commissioners agreed that staff should handle it as it is being done, and should apply some flexibility as to when completed applications are heard.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

2015 Updated Unresolved Planning Issues List

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
General Land Development Code-Related Improvements					
1	Consider modifying threshold list relative to architectural changes in PD Chapter so that if someone is proposing an improvement that can be specifically defined in the list, then a Major Modification is not triggered.	Policy/Clarification Item	Medium	8 (This would facilitate design improvements without further process, if written carefully)	Done Partially
2	Consider allowing a minor modification option for modest sign code changes in Planned Developments. Right now, any changes to an approved sign plan in a PD must go through the major modification process (see 4.7.90.09(d)).	Policy/Clarification Item	Small	8 (Approved sign plans are relatively rare within PD's; however, this item could be added to General "Code Tweaks" list in Item 1)	
3	Complete a thorough review of revised State Statutes and our land divisions standards, there are some inconsistencies (e.g., we allow administrative notes and	Correction Item - Mostly completed. Procedurally, Staff have completed the necessary	Medium	7 (A lower priority, since current practice has already been revised to correspond to	Partially Done - Changes to Prop. Line

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	setbacks to be placed on plats but the State won't accept this anymore).	research and are implementing the requirements. LDC language has not been revised to reflect this.		State requirements)	Adjstmts. only
4	Update the Order of Proceedings requirements in Chapter 2.0 - Public Hearings, to allow more flexibility in terms of order, to more closely match current Order of Proceedings handouts.	Correction Item	Small	6	
5	Evaluate merits of changing Section 2.0.50.08 - Voting Eligibility so that decision-makers may read minutes for a missed meeting in order to revive voting eligibility, as opposed to listening to tapes of a missed meeting, which is the current requirement of Section 2.0.50.08.	Policy Item	Small	6 (It may be difficult for Staff to turn around minutes in time to facilitate such a review, and there would typically not be time to allow for review and approval of minutes prior to use.	
6	Water Meter Placement (Clarifying that water meters could be placed within paved areas, such as driveways, in order to minimize conflicts with required	Policy/Clarification Item	Small	6 (This is not precluded by current code language, but including this in the code would facilitate requirements	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	vegetation, etc. on small lots.)			for such water meter placement, where appropriate)	
7	Add a reference to the requirements of Chapter 3.30 - Willamette River Greenway, for those properties falling within it in the Riverfront Zone. Specifically, it looks like the reference is needed in Sections 3.15.30.02 & 3.15.90.	Clarification Item	Small	5	
8	New lighting standards (i.e., lighting ordinance) that addresses outdoor lighting. (raised by citizen & CC member)	Policy/Clarification Item - Partially completed during the Code Update. Any larger efforts are on hold, due to size of project, and pending opportunity in future work program.	Large	5 (Staff recommend that the effectiveness of the new lighting provisions be evaluated prior to embarking on any larger efforts)	
9	Consider revising wireless antenna regulations because freestanding antennas are allowed to be 75 feet high with only a Plan Compatibility Review approval, while attached antennas are only allowed to be	Policy/Clarification Item	Medium	5 (Affects relatively few applications)	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	10 feet higher than a building. Attached antennas taller than 10 feet require a Conditional Development.				
10	Evaluate potential conflict between Table 4.0-1 - Street Functional Classification System and the text of Chapter 4.0 - Improvements Required with states that access control is required on Arterial Streets and the provision limiting access to one point on Arterial Streets was deleted from the text via Phase I of the Code Update. Evaluate whether it needs to be reinstated.	Clarification Item	Small	5 (It may be difficult to write specific requirements for access control that would make sense in all circumstances)	
11	Correct the ORS cite in Chapter 2.0 pertaining to M56 requirements to ORS.186, instead of ORS 227.175.	Correction Item	Small	4	
12	Evaluate the merits of establishing standards to prohibit the use of tractor trailers as signage opportunities.	Policy Item	Small	4	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
13	Consider further revisions to the solar energy policies of Comprehensive Plan (Article 12.2) and/or the regulations in LDC Chapter 4.6, to recognize the lack of adherence to, and/or, as some have argued, the lack of necessity for these.	Policy Item - First cut at accomplishing this task done as part of Natural Features Project Code Changes.	Medium or Large	3 (It is recommended that the effectiveness of the new solar access provisions be evaluated prior to embarking on any additional efforts)	
14	Construction Sales and Service Use Type description	Policy Item - Split out from Item #2 of 2009 Council Priority List, into a separate project by the City Council. This item was not identified as a priority item in the 2009 review.	Medium	3 (Affects relatively few applications)	
15	Evaluate the merits of only requiring one sign to be posted on smaller properties (i.e. less than 10,000 sq. ft.). Pertains to sign posting advertising a land use action.	Policy Item	Small	3 (Not a significant time or cost savings for Staff)	
16	Establish a Maximum Sign Height standard for the OSU Zone in Section 4.7.90.05, since all the other zones have such a	Policy Item	Small	3	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	standard.				
17	Consider/evaluate the merits of requiring some amount of single story dwellings in single family residential developments to address elderly and handicapped housing needs.	Policy Item	Medium	2 (Market factors may have more influence than regulation in this area. ADA addresses housing requirements for the disabled.)	
18	Evaluate the use type classification for assisted living facilities (i.e., assigning large apartment-like facilities for assisted living to the use type of group residential/group care may not adequately assess impacts).	Policy Item	Medium	2	
19	Planned Development Provisions - Potential response to DLCD direction regarding removing PD Overlays from residential properties ("Needed Housing" Issue).	Policy Item	Medium	2 (Unclear what remains to be done?)	Partially Done - 2012 LDC Amdmts.
20	Consider establishing a minimum beds per acre standard for the Group Residential Use Type so that a 6-bed facility isn't	Policy Item	Small or Medium	2 (Given typical land costs, this isn't a likely scenario)	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	developed on a 20-acre site.				
21	Consider creation of LDC language for regulation of free-standing, temporary car shelters.	Policy Item	Small	1	
22	Address condominium plats – do we need a process for review and approval of these? (Check with State and County regulations - Public Works would usually have a concern about converting private utilities to public utilities on these).	Policy Item - Awaiting a window of opportunity to review, but it is not likely that a new process would be needed or recommended.	Medium	0	
23	Review the definition of "infill" and determine if it should be used only relative to the implementation of Stormwater Master Plan and Comp Plan policies, or whether it should be modified or another definition added to address infill for other analyses.	Policy Item	Small or Medium	0 - Infill Task Force proposal not included in 2012 LDC Amendments due to complexity, concerns about unintended consequences. The establishment of special development standards in the University Neighborhoods Overlay area may have addressed some of the concerns regarding infill.	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
Historic Resource-Related Issues					
24	Down-zoning in Historic Districts	Policy Item - Awaiting a window of opportunity to evaluate.	Large	1 The Neighborhood Planning Work Group from the Corvallis / OSU Collaboration made a related recommendation to consider down-zoning in some of the neighborhoods near OSU, some of which contain Historic Districts.	
25	Development Standards in Historic Districts	Policy Item - Awaiting a window of opportunity to evaluate.	Large	1	
Natural Features and Natural Hazard-Related LDC Issues					
26	Changes to Land Development Code provisions related to Natural Resources, Natural Features, and Natural Hazards.	Policy/Clarification Item - On Hold, pending evaluation of the	Large - could require	11	Partially Done - 2012 LDC

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	This includes items such as creating a process to adjust mapped significant vegetation areas based on field conditions, exploring modifications to protections for some isolated tree grove areas, clarifying standards for development in steeply sloped areas, modifying standards for development in areas with human-altered topography, and modifying requirements for development within 500 feet of roughly-defined landslide hazard areas.	complete Planning Division Work Program in 2010.	revised ESEE Analysis		Amendments changed steep slope and landslide hazard provisions
27	3. Explore how preservation of Significant Trees and Significant Shrubs not addressed via Phase III can be made more clear and objective, rather than subject to the "preserved to the greatest extent practicable" standard in LDC Chapter 4.2. While the subject was discussed during the Natural Features Project, the effort was deferred by Council until adequate time could be allotted. Note: Historically Significant Trees, as defined in Chapter 1.6	Policy Item	Large	7	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	- Definitions, were already addressed with the Code Update.				
28	Evaluate how to address approved removal of Hazard Trees in terms of mitigation for the removal. Often the Hazard Tree is a tree that was required to be preserved, and mitigation is necessary to achieve the parameters of original land use approvals, etc.	Policy Item	Small	5 (Mitigation requirements for removal of hazard trees in resource areas is addressed in the LDC. However, some older Planned Development approvals do not address mitigation if trees required to be preserved must be removed due to hazard.)	
29	Evaluation of ideas outlined in Natural Features project Incentives White Paper	Policy Item	Large	5	
Economic Development and Downtown-Related Issues					
30	Consider investigating the possibility of architectural design standards for the Riverfront District - these would be standards that are different from the Pedestrian Oriented Design Standards in	Policy Item	Large	3	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	Chapter 4.10.				
Implementation Improvements (Other than LDC Changes)					
31	Update Buildable Lands Inventory following implementation of the Natural Features Project	Policy/Clarification Item - Consistent with Council direction from 2009 Work Program Review, Staff are beginning process to hire a consultant to begin the necessary land need analyses.	Large	9 (Council confirmed this project as a priority in November, 2009, but funding was cut in subsequent budget process)	
32	Need to develop a policy for how to calculate the 5-year supply of serviceable land for use in Annexations.	Policy/Clarification Item - Needed to facilitate review of annexation applications. Called for as Council Policy in LDC 2.6.30.07.a	Medium	8	
33	Provide resources necessary to complete a case history layer (i.e., a database that provides a geographic reference (GIS) for ArcView), and be able to connect this	Clarification Item - This project is well underway and mostly operational through	Large	8	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	information to public information resources, such as web access for citizens and staff). The case history layer has a good start, but much work remains in completing the history, and finalizing a usable format for the public and staff.	Corvallispermits.com. Work will continue as time and resources allow.			
34	Establish a vegetation management plan (VMP) guidebook and mechanisms for reviews. Outline clear approval criteria and establish a baseline management VMP that the public can use.	Clarification Item - Mostly completed, but still in process of finalizing.	Medium	7	
35	14. Municipal Code provisions, developed in conjunction with other City Departments, for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving vegetation, especially prior to development; and • Application of pesticides and herbicides. 	Policy/Clarification Item	Medium or Large	6	
36	Update the 1990 Urban Fringe Management Agreement with Benton	Policy Item	Large	2 (There is no identified problem that needs to be	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	County			fixed by an update, but the agreement is 25 years old)	
37	Creation of a regulatory mechanism for equitably sharing a right-of-way between adjacent property owners in order to facilitate underground parking structures.	Policy/Clarification Item	Medium	2 (The need for such a mechanism is very small at the current time)	Policy under development will address this question to some extent
38	Establish a guidebook/pamphlet for Natural Features Project provisions and do outreach and staff training.	Clarification Item - Mostly completed.	Medium		
39	Establish a guidebook/pamphlet for Phase I Code Update provisions and do outreach and staff training.	Clarification Item - Partially completed.	Medium	(The Phase I Code Update was completed with the LDC developed in 2000. It is unclear what portions of the "new" code are to be included	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
				in the guidebook.)	
40	UGB Map correction in North Corvallis for Butterfield Property.	Correction Item	Small	0	
Automobile Parking Issues					
41	7. Consider/evaluate the merits of using the new downtown parking requirements (1:1000) for area along Monroe, north of the University, and between approximately 14th and 26th Streets. This issue was recently revisited during the OSU Bookstore Major Modification.	Policy Item	Large	5	

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
	(NOTE: Re-evaluate and potentially increase this item's ranking based on findings from Downtown Strategic Plan and OSU Parking Study)				

Items added to the Unresolved Planning Issues List by the Planning Commission, March 16, 2011 (Items have not been sorted or scored and are not listed in order of priority):

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status

42	Add gateway standards to LDC 4.2.70.02 in order to implement Comp Plan policies 8.14.3 and 13.12.18, and the West Corvallis-North Philomath Plan, that identify Philomath Boulevard as a gateway street.	Clarification Item	Medium		
43	For development in a wetland, add LDC language to require an approved wetland fill permit from DSL prior to the land use application, rather than as a Condition of Approval.	Policy Item - May conflict with economic development goals, may not be consistent with DSL policy on fill permits.	Medium		
44	Delete LDC Section 4.11.50.02.c.2, which gives additional MADA credits for "areas of wetland mitigation... when infrastructure must be extended through a wetland."	Policy Item	Medium		
45	Consider using SDC credits as an alternative method to compensate for the cost of wetland mitigation.		Large - if SDC changes are involved		
46	Evaluate whether it is appropriate to allow surface stormwater detention facilities within protected natural resource areas if the soils do not allow significant percolation, or if other factors preclude infiltration in these areas.	Policy Item	Medium		

47	If needed, clarify definitions of "Area, Net" and "Floor Area Ratio" to ensure the intent that the acreage of protected natural resources and hazards is removed before making FAR calculations.	Clarification Item	Small		
48	Consider allowing accessory buildings to remain on a site if the primary structure has been removed or demolished.	Policy Item	Small		Partially Done for some Ag. buildings
49	Consider a reduced width for planter strips along neighborhood collector streets (perhaps 6 feet rather than 12 feet).	Policy Item	Medium		
50	Consider changing housing variety requirements for development of between 5 and 10 acres by reducing the required percentage of alternative housing types or similar changes.	Policy Item	Small		
51	Reevaluate the West Corvallis Access Strategy in light of access management restrictions, natural features constraints, and trail and park facility requirements in the area.	Clarification Item	Medium		

Items added to the Unresolved Planning Issues List by the Planning Commission, March 18, 2015 (Items have not been sorted or scored and are not listed in order of priority):

#	Issue	Status - "Policy" indicates a policy decision; "Clarification" indicates an item will clarify an issue in question; "Correction" indicates a correction of a perceived error in the LDC	Level of Effort	Avg. Score (0 - 12) - based on 0-3 pts. for each category: 1) improves public service; 2) saves time and/or money; 3) facilitates implementation; and 4) improves legal framework	Completion Status
52	Consider including a requirement for conduit for fiber optic cables in our standard street specifications.	Policy Item	?		
53	Develop scaling factor or formula to determine a "density equivalent" for congregate care facilities, nursing homes, etc.	Policy Item	?		

Items added at September 16, 2015, Planning Commission Meeting:

54	Consider recommendation from Jan Napack (see submitted testimony) to revise the LDC to better address homeless shelters, including zoning and standards for shelter operation.	Policy Item	?		
----	--	--------------------	---	--	--

55	Consider modifying LDC so that a change to a Conceptual and Detailed Development Plan that makes a proposed development more code-compliant does not have to be reviewed through a Major Modification public hearing process, but could instead be reviewed and approved by staff if requirements are met.	Policy Item	?		
----	--	-------------	---	--	--



Community Development
Planning Division
501 SW Madison Avenue
Corvallis, OR 97333

**DRAFT
CITY OF CORVALLIS
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
November 4, 2015**

Present

Jasmin Woodside, Chair
Ronald Sessions, Vice Chair
Carl Price
Paul Woods
Tom Jensen
Roger Lizut
Jim Ridlington
Rob Welsh
Penny York, Council Liaison

Staff

Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager
Terry Nix, Recorder

Excused

G. Tucker Selko

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

	Agenda Item	Recommendations
I.	Visitor Propositions	
II.	Review of the Unresolved Planning Issues List	Information.
III.	Planning Commission Minutes – October 7, 2015	Approved as presented.
IV.	Old Business	
V.	New Business	
VI.	Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

The Corvallis Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Jasmin Woodside at 7:00 p.m. in the Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room, 400 NW Harrison Boulevard.

I. VISITOR'S PROPOSITIONS: There were no propositions brought forward.

II. REVIEW OF THE UNRESOLVED PLANNING ISSUES LIST

Chair Woodside said the Planning Commission began a review of the 2015 Updated Unresolved Planning Issues List at the October 7 and October 21 meetings. She led a continued review of items on the list, beginning with Item #26.

Item #26:

Planning Manager Young said that some of this work was done in a recent Code amendment package but staff feel additional changes would be helpful. In terms of urgency, these issues come up from time to time for individuals who are looking to develop in areas that are encumbered by natural features. In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Young said these changes are not included in the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) update, that the more accurate LIDAR data could result in either more or less constraints on an individual property, and that the goal of the program is to not put people in harm's way. He explained the Economic, Social, Environmental, Energy (ESEE) Analysis required for the City's Goal 5 review. Commissioner Price wondered if information on the City's fault lines should be included in the hazards section. Mr. Young said it was previously decided, in consultation with experts at OSU, to not include protections in the area of the Corvallis Fault because we don't want to give people a false sense of security when we don't know if that fault is active, or if there are other faults in the area. This could be further explored, however. Agreement: Keep on the list; medium priority; low simplicity/lack of complexity.

Item #27:

Manager Young reviewed concerns that have come up about the "preserved to the greatest extent practicable" standard in Chapter 4.2, in that it is a subjective standard and there is some desire to protect trees outside of areas designated in the Natural Features project. Brief discussion followed regarding potential clear and objective standards. Mr. Young noted the Minimum Assured Development Area (MADA) provisions would allow some development on a property encumbered by natural features protections. Agreement: Strike from the list.

Item 28:

Manager Young said mitigation requirements for removal of hazard trees in resource areas is addressed in the LDC; however, some older Planned Development approvals do not address mitigation if trees must be removed due to hazard. Discussion followed regarding how this might apply to City trees and Manager Young reviewed a "fee for a tree" program that is currently in discussion. Commissioner Woods said he would not want this to apply retroactively to previous approvals. Commissioner Jensen said he would like to retain the item and he would like it to apply retroactively. Agreement: Revise the item to include discussion about whether provisions should be applied retroactively and how provisions are applied to City-owned trees; keep the item as revised; low priority; high simplicity/lack of complexity.

Item 29:

Manager Young said he will bring the Natural Features Project White Paper to a future meeting. Agreement: Keep on the list; low priority; low simplicity/lack of complexity.

Item 30:

Brief discussion followed regarding design standards in the Riverfront zone. Agreement: Strike from the list.

Item 31:

It was noted that the Building Land Inventory update is underway. Agreement: Strike from the list.

Item 32:

Manager Young said one of the annexation criteria refers to the need to follow Council policy to calculate the five-year supply of serviceable land; however, that policy has not yet been developed. Commissioner Sessions asked if this work could tie into the BLI. Manager Young said that isn't part of the current contract with the consultant; however, he will explore the possibility of including it as an add-on item. Agreement: Add wording to recommend that this be addressed during the BLI Update; keep on the list as revised; high priority; medium simplicity.

Item 33:

Manager Young said staff has developed some of the case history layer referred to in this item. It is a helpful tool for staff but the public interface is not yet there. This work will continue as time and resources allow. Agreement: Strike from the list.

Item 34:

The group discussed ways in which a vegetation management plan (VMP) guidebook would be helpful for the community in encouraging people to do the right thing. Agreement: Keep on the list; low priority; medium simplicity.

Item 35:

Chair Woodside noted this item includes developing Municipal Code provisions for two separate items – preserving vegetation prior to development and application of pesticides and herbicides. Commissioner Price and Councilor York shared information heard at a Council meeting that there is a state preemption on pesticide use restrictions at the local level. Discussion followed regarding situations where a property owner has removed vegetation prior to submitting a land use application. Commissioner Woods asked if there could be a fire protection aspect to this. Manager Young said the city is currently in a process of reconciling wildfire protection measures with the Natural Features Code to allow for activities in the wildland urban interface area. Agreement: Strike the second bullet from the list; keep the first bullet on the list; low priority; low simplicity.

Item 36:

Manager Young said the Urban Fringe Management Agreement with Benton County is 25 years old; however, there is no identified problem. The City has a good working relationship with Benton County, and he thinks any problems that arise could be addressed administratively. Agreement: Strike from the list.

Item 37:

In response to questions from the Commission, Manager Young said the situation referenced in this item has occurred only once in recent memory. Agreement: Strike from the list.

Items 38 and 39:

Commissioners discussed whether it would be beneficial to establish guidebooks for sections of the Land Development Code or whether that time would be better used to develop more reader-friendly LDC language. Agreement: Revise the item to read "Rewrite the LDC provisions in clearer language"; keep the item as revised; high priority; low simplicity.

Item 40:

Manager Young said he will need to look into the background on this item. Agreement: Keep the item pending additional feedback from staff.

Councilor York suggested that the Planning Commission think not just about what is on the list, which is what people have noticed in the past would be helpful, but also about bigger issue things and upcoming opportunities related to the Vision Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and Land Development Code. Especially with the larger issues, consideration could be given to philosophical questions including whether the Commission would like the LDC to provide more flexibility or less; more discretion at the staff level or less.

III. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES:

October 7, 2015:

MOTION: Commissioner Price moved to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner Sessions seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

IV. OLD BUSINESS: None.

V. NEW BUSINESS:

Planning Division Manager Young said Commissioner Selko has advised that he will be stepping down from the Planning Commission, but that he will stay on until his seat is filled.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.